

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BARDY NGUYEN,	)	
	)	No. C06-0951RSL
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
	)	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE	)	OR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR
CLINIC (RENTON),	)	ORDER
	)	
Defendant.	)	

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's filing styled as: "Cause; Reverse the Dismissal As the Defendants Have Chosen to Mediate the Case" (Dkt. #25). The Court considers plaintiff's one-paragraph filing as both: (1) a motion for reconsideration of the Court's December 29, 2006 order (Dkt. #23) and judgment (Dkt. #24) dismissing plaintiff's claims; and (2) a motion for relief from judgment or order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60.

First, motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district, and the "court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has not met her burden under this rule. In her motion, plaintiff asserts that she "was never informed by the courts [sic] that there was a hearing to dismiss my case. I was suppose [sic] to know." See

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR ORDER

1 Motion at 1. However, the Court is not persuaded by this assertion given that plaintiff  
 2 responded to defendant's motion to dismiss on October 23, 2006. See Dkt. #15 ("Response to  
 3 Dismiss"). Furthermore, the Court concludes that there is no support for plaintiff's claim that  
 4 "The defendants has [sic] already agreed and signed paperwork to go to mediation the first week  
 5 in February 07 and the case was to be settled this way." See Motion at 1. As part of her motion,  
 6 plaintiff attached a copy of the parties' November, 2006 Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan  
 7 including plaintiff's handwritten note stating that "Because of needing ongoing medical [sic]  
 8 [mediation] [s]hould be set up Feb. 07 1st week." See Motion at 3. The fact that the parties  
 9 selected mediation in their Joint Status Report as the desired alternative dispute resolution  
 10 process under Local Civil Rule 39.1 did not, however, create an obligation to resolve the dispute  
 11 by mediation. See, e.g., Local Civil Rule 39.1(a)(6) ("No party shall be bound by anything done  
 12 or said during such [ADR] proceedings unless a settlement or other agreement is reached.").  
 13 Because plaintiff has not shown manifest error in the Court's December 29, 2006 order  
 14 dismissing her case or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the  
 15 court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence" plaintiff's filing is denied as a motion for  
 16 reconsideration.

17 Plaintiff has also not met any of the six categories under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) for relief  
 18 from the judgment or the order of dismissal in this case. In her motion, plaintiff has not shown:

19 (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered  
 20 evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered . . . ; (3) fraud . .  
 21 . misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party; (4) the judgment is  
 22 void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior  
 judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no  
 longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application; or (6) any  
 other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment.

23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Accordingly, plaintiff's filing is denied as a motion for relief from  
 24 judgment or order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60.

25 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion to "Reverse the Dismissal as the

26 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
 OR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR ORDER

1 Defendants Have Chosen to Mediate the Case” (Dkt. #25) is DENIED.

2  
3 DATED this 2nd day of February, 2007.

4  
5 

6 Robert S. Lasnik  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR ORDER